

**6th CSPCWG MEETING  
Monaco 1-3 December 2009**

**Paper for Consideration by CSPCWG**

**S-49 Edition 2: Standardization of Mariners' Routeing Guides**

<b>Submitted by:</b>	Chairman
<b>Executive Summary:</b>	CSPCWG was tasked by CHRIS19 to prepare a new edition of IHO publication S-49 'Standardization of Mariners' Routeing Guides'.
<b>Related Documents:</b>	S-49.
<b>Related Projects:</b>	None

**Introduction / Background**

The task of revising IHO Special Publication No.49 'Recommendations concerning Mariners' Routeing Guides' (CHRIS19 Action 24) has been progressed by our S-49 subWG, under the leadership of Germany (Jens Schröder-Fürstenberg). CSPCWG Letter 12/2009 invited you to comment on the new draft document produced by the sub-WG.

9 WG members responded to Letter 12/2009 providing comments on the 'beta version' draft of S-49 Edition 2. These responses are summarized in the annex by Jens, who has worked through all of these, amending the draft as appropriate. Further examination was conducted by Chairman and Secretary CSPCWG, resulting in a few minor changes. A 'release candidate' of the new edition of S-49 document is now available as a conference document which includes track changes identifying the more significant amendments. It is hoped that a few outstanding issues can be resolved at this meeting, so that the final 'release candidate' can be offered to IHO Member States for approval.

**Analysis / Discussion** – see Annex

**Recommendations**

After discussion of remaining questions, remove residual comments and track changes and submit S-49 for IHO MS approval.

**Action required of CSPCWG**

The CSPCWG is invited to examine the 'release candidate' version of S-49 and:

- a. discuss outstanding queries highlighted above and in S-49;
- b. agree final wording and format in preparation for release to IHO Member States.

**Consolidated responses to CSPCWG Letter 12/2009**  
(ordered by date comments received)

No	QUESTION (please do not answer YES to more than one)	YES	NO
1a	Do you support the inclusion of thumbnail images of sample MRGs within document S-49? If you reply 'Y', and your office produces a MRG, please attach a sample thumbnail image of each document, suitably titled, that you are willing to release for inclusion		7
1b	Do you support the inclusion of a list of MRGs available (at November 2009) Whether you reply 'Y' or 'N', please supply a list of MRGs that your office publishes(i.e. chart reference numbers)	6	1
1c	Do you consider that there is no requirement to include further details of specific or sample MRGs within document S-49?	4	3

Other comments on beta draft are collected below

No	Responding HO	Comment and proposals	Decision
1	ZA	Consider the spelling of the word 'Standardization' for consistency under <b>Introduction</b> Para 1 last sentence.	done
	ZA continued	Regional Hydrographic Commission (RHC) .....under 2.5 Language and symbology, Para 3 last sentence	done
		Contents page numbering right aligned (just as a	done
		reminder).	
		Check interline/inter-paragraph spacing in between paragraphs from para 1 to para 3.1.5.	done
		Comments: South Africa does not publish MRGs. It might be a good idea for the user to know which MRGs are available.	no action required; see questionnaire
		ZA's comments on the earlier version, via CSPCWG Letter 7/2009 but received late, have also been included in the release candidate, as appropriate.	See comments in release candidate
2	CA	The Canadian Hydrographic Service does not have a published MRG in its inventory	no action required
3	ES	The Spanish Hydrographic Office does not publish MRG	no action required
4	GR	NIL	no action required
5	US	The meaning of the first paragraph of Section 2.5 (Language and symbology) is still not clear to us.  The 'Mariners' Routeing Guide' is normally designed to be used for international shipping and should be produced in the English language. The	the second version of the proposed amendments makes the intention clearer, text amended accordingly.

No	Responding HO	Comment and proposals	Decision
		<p>'Mariners' Routeing Guide' may also be produced in the National language, if other than English.</p> <p>This paragraph could be interpreted as meaning that as an alternative to an English language only product, the option is for a bilingual product in English and the National language; or it could mean that a second product in the national language is an option in addition to the English version of the product; or the paragraph could mean that the guide may be produced in the National language only as an alternative to English.</p> <p>The U.S. recommends the following text change:</p> <p>The "Mariners' Routeing Guide" is normally designed to be used for international shipping and should be produced in the English language. The "Mariners' Routeing Guide" may also be produced as a bilingual product in both English and the National language, if the National language is other than English.</p> <p>If the intent of Section 2.5 is for two different products, one in English and one in the National language, the following text change is recommended:</p> <p>The "Mariners' Routeing Guide" is normally designed to be used for international shipping and should be produced in the English language. The "Mariners' Routeing Guide" may be produced in an English language version and in an optional National language version, if the National language is other than English.</p> <p>If the intent of Section 2.5 is for the use of the national language as a substitute for English, the following text change is recommended:</p> <p>The "Mariners' Routeing Guide" is normally designed to be used for international shipping and should be produced in the English language. The "Mariners' Routeing Guide" may be produced in the National language, instead of English, if the National language is other than English.</p>	<p><b>Chair CSPCWG: I think the first version (ie bilingual) could also be an option if space permits. Addition to text made accordingly. For further discussion at CSPCWG6.</b></p>

No	Responding HO	Comment and proposals	Decision
6	NL	<p>Ref. 1b: The Netherlands publishes :</p> <p>Chart 1970- "The Mariners' Routeing Guide Southern North Sea", scale 1: 550 000, edition July 2008 ( this Passage Planning Chart adjoins Charts BA 5500 and DE 2910)</p> <p>Chart HP8- " Deep Draught Planning Guide Greenwich Buoy to Europoort", scale 1:375 000, edition July 2008( for vessels with a draught between 20,7 m and 22,6 m)</p>	see new section 4
7	AU	<p>The Australian Hydrographic Service does not produce MRGs.</p> <p>Am in favour with 1b assuming that IHB (through CSPCWG?) can maintain such a list. If a list is included then any HO wishing to compile its own guide for the first time may be able to access examples from the list, making 1a and 1c not required.</p>	no action required  see new section 4
8	SE	<p>Sweden does not produce Mariners' Routeing Guides and has no comments on the above questions.</p> <p>We do however have an open question about Mariners Routeing Guides. Sweden does produce a chart which we call a Planning Chart over the Lake Mälaren and the approach to this lake. This chart is structured in the same way as a MRG in order to describe a complex traffic situation but there are no IMO adopted Routeing Measures in this area. According to paragraph 2.3 it could not be considered a MRG as we understand it. However in all other aspects S-49 would describe this chart perfectly. Our question is then; could also other "Planning Charts" than those related to IMO-adopted routing systems be considered as MRGs? If no; should there be another standardized name for such charts if S-49 is applicable in all other aspects?</p> <p><b>Chair CSPCWG:</b> <b>I think this is a question to be considered at CSPCWG6. We determined during the revision of section B-430 that routeing symbols should not be differentiated for IMO and non-IMO routeing systems, so why should non-IMO routeing systems not justify a MRG?</b></p>	no action required  in fact, apart from some recommended routes the lake Mälaren has no routeing measures established; as the chart indicates  If a further recommendation concerning planning charts is requested is out of scope for this work, but it is thinkable that a future version of S-49 can combine information on MRG and planning charts as well; perhaps version 3?

No	Responding HO	Comment and proposals	Decision
9	Indonesia	NIL	no action required

Additional comments by Chairman CSPCWG.

I can see no reason to refer to section 3 of S-49 as an Appendix. If it is an appendix, it should not continue the numbering. My suggestion is to treat it as Section 3 (with some consequential small changes to paragraph titles and numbering. Also, the new list of published MRGs cannot really form part of 'Content' in Section 3 (former Appendix), so we have numbered that as Section 4 (although that could perhaps be more appropriately an Annex).